

**Idaho Medical Home Collaborative**  
**Meeting Notes – August 26, 2015**

**Present:** Scott Dunn (co-chair), Lisa Hettinger (co-chair), Matt Wimmer, Neva Santos, Cathy Libby, Julie Triptke, Heather Clark, Cynthia York, Kim Schreiber, Tim Heinze, Kevin Rich, David Schmidt, Mary Sheridan, Susie Pouliot, Irene Collie, Teresa Martin

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<b>Welcome and Agenda Review</b>	<b>Lisa Hettinger</b> welcomed the group. The previous meeting notes were reviewed and accepted.
<b>IHC Update on the Application of Interest Process</b>	<p><b>Lisa</b> expressed her thanks for everyone’s input and hard work in getting the Application of Interest to the IHC. For those of you who were at the IHC meeting, Lisa confirmed that the copy that was presented was not the final draft as there was a version control issue. The final changes requested by this group have been reinstated into the document and the final document is official with the IHC.</p> <p><b>Heather Clark</b> said that the final document has been completed and is being created in a dynamic form which will be available on-line for clinics to submit. At the same time they are also completing an email package that will be emailed to all clinics. In that package there will be an application and a cover letter from Dr. Epperly, introducing what the SHIP program is. They also took the time-line and cleaned it up and made it more of a high level document. They hope to get everything mailed out by August 31<sup>st</sup>. The deadline is September 14<sup>th</sup> with some grace period for those that are mailed in.</p> <p><b>Scott Dunn</b> expressed his concern that one contact with a clinic may not be enough and asked if there is going to be any type of follow-up. Heather replied yes they are planning on some kind of follow-up.</p> <p><b>Lisa</b> said that the IHC appreciates all of the efforts that were put into the application and were very happy with the outcome. One of the things that Dr. Epperly discussed in the last IHC meeting was the IHC interests in this workgroup being involved in the review of those initial interested applications.</p> <p><b>Heather</b> said that the applications of interest will be received at the SHIP department and they have a couple of mechanisms were they will be able to pinpoint geographically where the most interest is coming from and will report that back to this group.</p>

Lisa said that Dr. Epperly' s comments were general in nature and we may need clarification from him that we can then email to the committee members because we need to determine if there is a need for the next meeting, steps that the IMHC would take to be engaged, etc. Lisa was hoping there might be more details, but if there aren't, we can research that and get information out to everyone. There is anticipation that we will be engaged at some level, whether it be reviewing the number of clinics or the distribution of clinics or looking at questions that are germane to PCMH readiness.

**Cynthia York** stated that their plan is to categorize the applications geographically, but it will also begin looking at their readiness level. This is what they will take back to the IHC.

**Lisa** said that as far as the timeline you have queued up for the application process, what approximate date will you have that available for the IMHC. Heather said she is hoping by the end of September.

**Kevin Rich** commented that in looking back at IMHC's work with accepting applications for the pilot, this proposal is very ambitious. He said that he and Karl Watts said down and went thru all of the applications to present to the IMHC for the pilot and that took some time.

**Heather** said that they are initially going to categorize these initial applications and then the final application process will be more tedious and will require more of refined review.

**Scott** said that what we are talking about now is a more superficial intent to apply, shorter process due by the 14<sup>th</sup>, which is not the full application. It should be more demographic information rather than a lot of detail and should be easy to collate and categorize. Scott asked if all of the people who expressed interest will subsequently be sent the full application or is there a selection process off of the initial letter of intent?

**Cynthia** stated that they will categorize these mostly geographically and doesn't expect that it will be very difficult to be put in a format that IMHC can look at. Their intent is for an official application, which is more in depth, and will go out to everyone that expressed an interest.

**Scott** said as for our next meeting, we should try to plan for whatever data is available so we can be prepared going forward even if it is not complete. **Lisa** said that the other possibility is that we could target our next meeting for Wednesday the 30<sup>th</sup> and give a little more time to the process.

<p><b>Review of the IMHC Charter</b></p>	<p><b>Lisa</b> talked about the IMHC charter document and reminds committee members that these project charters are meant to be living documents, so what we are doing here may not be set in stone, but is a starting point.</p> <p><b>Heather</b> stated that in deliverable one under description it should read “The IMHC as a work group will receive requests for input from the <b>IHC</b>, and will research and provide recommendations to the IHC in various subject areas relative to the implementation of the SHIP”.</p> <p><b>Lisa</b> said that the arrangement of the Chair/Co-Chair should read Scott Dunn, MD as Chair and Lisa Hettinger and Co-chair. The biggest change that was made to this document was really to memorialize some of the work that had been done. When we originally looked at this document it was being treated as a document going forward, but there was a desire to memorialize some of the deliverables already accomplished and to change it structurally so it was very descriptive of the products we are delivering. Deliverable’s will increase as “asks” from the IHC to the workgroup come thru.</p> <p><b>Scott</b> stated that in terms of the composition of the IMHC when we were on our own Executive Order we had a frame or listing of the stakeholders that were a part of this and that information isn’t outlined in this charter. Lisa said this was a change that Mercer suggested. She isn’t sure and liked having the members listed but it may not be in the spirit of what they are trying to accomplish in these charters.</p> <p><b>Heather</b> replied that Lisa is correct. Mercer did suggest this and work does continue on the stakeholder list. It will be an attachment or addendum to the charter.</p> <p><b>Scott</b> commented that we want to have is as clear of direction from the IHC as possible as to what they expect from us as a sub workgroup. The communication has been a little loose and maybe Mercer can help with that. How do we get the message back and forth as to what the IHC wants of this group so we can be as productive as we can?</p> <p><b>Cynthia</b> commented that this is in Mercer’s scope and wanted to let everyone know that the PCMH contractor will hopefully be on board by the next meeting. She is hopeful by the next meeting that we will have more direction from the PCMH contractor as to what their expectations are from the IMHC.</p>
<p><b>Next Meeting</b></p>	<p>The next meeting is scheduled as a conference call on September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015 from 12:00 to 1:30 PM MT</p>